

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/656,644 | BROAD, KERRY CHARLES | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Ernesto Garcia | 3679 | |

All Participants:

(1) Ernesto Garcia.

(2) Stephen B. Schott.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 8 January 2007

Time: 1:50PM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 U.S.C 112(2nd) rejection

Claims discussed:

claim 1

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The preamble of claim 1 was discussed to clarify a conflict with the body of claim 1. Since the stairs (or steps), which are positively claimed as part of the claimed invention, are recited in the body, the preamble required modification. Accordingly, the preamble of claim 1 was suggested to be deleted. A further change to claim 1 was discussed. The examiner suggested to add the "stairs" as one of the features of the mechanism of claim 1.